

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are amended. Claims 20-26 are canceled.

In the Office Action of April 25, 2008, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1-2, 13-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,000 ("Woolsey"); (2) rejected claims 3-5, 15 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,210,828 ("Bolan"); and (3) rejected claims 6-12, 16-19 and 23-26 as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/00624427 ("Chauvel").

With this response, Applicants amend claims 1 and 13. Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request reconsideration.

I. ART BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey. Applicant amends claim 1 to more clearly define over Woolsey's teaching of executing plurality of operating systems in a multi-processor system.

Claim 1, as amended, recites: "...only the first processor configured to execute a single operating system, the second processor not executing an operating system...." This feature is not shown or suggested by Woolsey as noted by the Examiner in paragraph 31 of the previous Office Action, in which the Examiner stated: "In order to overcome the teaching of Woolsey, examiner suggested applicant to amend the claims to clarify that the system only have no more than one operating system such as 'where in the second processor is not hosted any operating system' or similar language."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Woolsey, and all claims which depend on claim 1 (claims 2-12) should be allowed.

B. Claim 13

Claim 13 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey.

Claim 13, as amended, recites: "...the single operating system executing on only one of a plurality of processors, the remaining ones of the plurality of processors not executing an operating system...." This feature is not shown or suggested by Woolsey as noted by the Examiner in paragraph 31 of the previous Office Action, in which the Examiner stated: "In order to overcome the teaching of Woolsey, examiner suggested applicant to amend the claims to clarify that the system only have no more than one operating system such as 'where in the second processor is not hosted any operating system' or similar language."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over Woolsey, and all claims which depend on claim 13 (claims 14-19) should be allowed.

C. Claims 20-26

Claims 20-26 have been canceled

II. CONCLUSION

In course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees

Appl. No. 10/632,077
Amdt. dated June 16, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 8, 2009

required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Wade J. Brady III/

Wade J. Brady III
Registration No. 32,080
Texas Instruments Incorporated
(972) 917-4371